

CGIAR Fund Council

November 8-9, 2011

IFAD, Rome, Italy

Meeting Summary



CGIAR Fund Office
December 8, 2011

Agenda Item 1. Opening Session

The CGIAR Fund Council (FC) met at IFAD, Italy on November 8 and 9, 2011. Fund Council Chair Inger Andersen opened the meeting. She welcomed Rachel Kyte, World Bank Vice President and Head of Sustainable Development Network (SDN) who joined the FC meeting (FC6) as an observer. The Chair also welcomed new Council members attending the FC meeting for the first time.

Rodney Cooke (IFAD) was elected Co-chair of the meeting.

The Chair requested for comments or motion to adopt the provisional agenda.

Gates Foundation requested adding metrics for measuring efficiency gains as an agenda item under Any Other Business (Agenda Item 15).

FAO requested adding an information item on the event FAO is organizing to celebrate the 40th Anniversary of the CGIAR in Dec 2011.

The Consortium Chair requested adding CGIAR Funding for GCARD 2 as an item for discussion.

The agenda was adopted with the addition of the above three items.

In accordance with the FC Rules of Procedure, the Chair reminded the Fund Council members to declare any conflicts of interest regarding Fund Council business and agenda items.

Agenda Item 2. Fund Office Report and Follow-Up Actions

Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary of the Fund Council and Head of the Fund Office (FO) presented a report on FO achievements since July 2011. Some of the highlights of Fund Office activities are:

- working on the Common Operational Framework (COF);
- working to bring FC members and the Consortium to a convergence on intellectual assets management principles and policy;
- working with the Trustee on the Predictability of Funding paper;
- working with EC and IFAD over the EC contributions to the CGIAR through the Fund;
- visits to Japan and Australia to discuss future relationships and funding for the CGIAR;
- participation of the FC Chair to the Consortium Board Meeting at CIAT, in Cali Columbia;
- Executive Secretary's attendance at the ISPC Meeting at CIMMYT and visit to CIFOR and CIP where he conducted town hall meetings to update staff on the CGIAR reform.

Jonathan provided an update on the Expected Flow of Funds through the Fund as per the table below:

- 24 donors have completed their Contribution Agreements, channeling \$332m to the Fund as of November 4;
- Five countries agreed to multi-year funding through the Fund;

Expected Flow of Funds through the Fund

in \$ million As of Nov. 4, 2011				
	Received	Confirmed ¹	Expected ²	Total Funding
Window 1	185	28	57	270
Window 2	22	17	16	55
Window 3	26	24	20	70
Provisional	4	27	-	30
Fund Inflows	237	95	93	425
Outflows	121			
Fund Balance	116			

¹CAs already signed or are ready for signature

²Contributions as indicated from on-going communications with donors

Agenda Item 3. Consortium Report

Consortium Board (CB) Chair Carlos Perez del Castillo updated the Fund Council on Consortium activities focusing on developments since the July 2011 Fund Council Meeting. He assured the FC that the Consortium Board had taken immediate action to ensure a smooth and efficient transition following the resignation of the Consortium CEO Lloyd Le Page. The Board appointed an Executive Committee consisting of 4 board members (Ganesan Balachander, Lynn Haight, Carl Haussman and Carlos Perez del Castillo), to oversee the work of the Consortium Office and ensure that there are no disruptions in the functioning of the Consortium. The recruitment process for the new CEO is already underway. In the interim, the Executive Committee will assume responsibility for a smooth transition until the new CEO is on board, which is expected to be early next year.

Activities of the Consortium since the last FC, included:

- approval and submission to the FC of all remaining CRPs;
- a draft policy paper on “Making the 2% Happen”;
- development of a shared understanding of Centers’ IP activities and reaching convergence on intellectual asset management;
- approval of the Consortium level Gender Strategy and recruitment of a Senior Gender Advisor;
- development of a Consortium Monitoring strategy and approval of the principles in this Strategy;
- development of a draft CGIAR Communications strategy, including a CGIAR branding strategy;
- outreach activities including the “Food Crisis in the Horn of Africa: challenges and opportunities for mitigating drought-induced food crises”, a combined media briefing and learning event; the G-20 Conference on Agricultural Research for Development held in Montpellier; and the thirty-seventh Session of the Committee on World Food Security.

Discussion:

Discussions on Agenda Items 2 and 3 were held after the presentation of the Consortium Report.

- Gates Foundation reiterated that its contributions will be channeled through Window 3 to the extent possible and the Foundation continues to look for opportunities to move into Window 2 wherever feasible.
- Canada requested clarification from the Consortium Chair on whether there is a framework in place for mainstreaming gender within the CRPs and what could FC expect to occur in this regard over the next few years.
- On IFAD's question whether there are any key messages emerging from the town hall meetings at CIFOR and CIP that could apply to the other 13 centers as well, Jonathan responded that at the Center level knowledge of the progress of the reforms is not extensive. Staff continued to be concerned about the effect of the changes on their Center and the stability of Center budgets. The town hall meetings allowed staff to understand the role of CRPs and how they fit in system-wide, and to have an open dialogue on the CGIAR reform and its impact on them.
- USAID informed the Fund Council members that while they were unable to deliver all US funding through the Fund this year, an additional \$71m was contributed through the old multi-donor trust fund. In the future those funds will shift to the Fund, primarily to Window 3.
- USAID also inquired about the ISPC papers on synthesis of governance issues across the CRP proposals and on the synthesis of gender issues, and asked whether these would be discussed. The ISPC Chair clarified that the papers were intended to provide input to the ongoing work on CRP-level strategies on gender, and to the Consortium Board's plan to examine the governance of the CRP portfolio. ISPC made an extra effort to get them done as soon as possible to take advantage of the contribution of external reviewers of the CRPs. Jonathan also elaborated that the Fund Office wished to make the reports available to FC members; hence it was posted on the FC6 documents web site although the reports had not been tabled for discussion.

Conclusion:

- *The reports of the Consortium, Fund Office, and Trustee were accepted.*

Agenda Item 4. 2012 CRP Financing Plan

Gordon MacNeil, Director of Finance and Corporate Services at the Consortium Office presented the 2011 financing update and the 2012 CRP Financing Plan.

Gordon commented that presently the Centers are operating on 2 business models (old and new) in parallel; hence it has been a challenging year for them to seamlessly merge into the new business model. Nonetheless it has been a successful year, particularly as most of the CRPs are approved and funding for the programs has started to flow to the Centers concerned.

On the 2011 financing update, Gordon highlighted the following:

- 2011 funding estimates for Window 1 (\$194m), Window 2 including a probable additional inflow (\$67m), Window 3 (\$68m) and provisional account (\$7m) totaling US\$348m available resources in the Fund;
- Total funding in 2011 is estimated at \$706 m as compared to \$641m in 2010, with a significant rise in nearly unrestricted funding in Windows 1.

2012 financing estimates and issues were highlighted as follows:

- Approximately \$245m is expected from Windows 1 and 2 for CRP budgets;
- The total demand for Windows 1 and 2 funds for original CRP budgets is expected to be \$400m. This amount takes into account adjustments for split years for CRPs that began operations mid-year and year 2 costs in the case of GRiSP and CCAFS;
- Theoretical funding gap of \$155m for Windows 1 and 2 funds;
- To reduce the theoretical funding gap, mechanical adjustments will first be carried out to re-calculate the probable Windows 1 and 2 demand, followed by a review of CRP strategic priorities, if necessary;
- The Consortium Board will develop specific plans and a firm timetable for a possible deeper strategic review of the portfolio when it meets in February 2012;
- The Consortium Board will recommend a 2012 CRP budget for Fund Council approval in March 2012.

Discussion:

- FC Members raised concerns about the funding gap in 2012 and commented that much of it is an artificial gap which does not take into account the significant amount of resources that are restricted or in Window 3. It was explained that estimates do take into account all known funding income, but at the moment it is possible that the bilateral funding estimate is on the low side. It will be updated for the preparation of the final version of financing plan.
- Clarification was requested on the rationale of Centers not relying entirely on Windows 1 and 2 resources. It was pointed out that the Centers' and Consortium estimates are consistent with what was forecast in the CRP proposals in terms of funding types, especially for year 1 budgets.
- A better definition of Window 3 funds and restricted funds outside the Fund was requested, as both sources of funding are restricted funds. It was explained that the main difference is that the cost-sharing percentage is automatically taken from Window 3 grants by the Trustee, whereas the responsibility for collecting this percentage falls to Centers for grants outside the Fund. It appears likely that there will be a gradual shift wherein donors will use Window 3 increasingly even for restricted grants, and the Consortium sees this as a positive development.
- On a procedural matter, it was requested that handouts of all powerpoint presentations at FC meetings be shared with the FC members to enable note taking and following the presentation on the printed copy. This was agreed upon.
- It was pointed out that a positive message is required to be sent to the CGIAR system. Funding in 2012 may reach \$800m if in fact the restricted funding for 2012 is at least at historical levels and this is a phenomenal increase from \$530m in 2008 (prior to the reform).
- It was pointed out that the level of bilateral support for 2011 remains approximately \$460m as estimated in July 2011. This amount is reflected in the Consortium presentation table titled Total 2011 funding estimate and 2010 actual CGIAR financing.

In response, Gordon clarified that it was always the intention that CRPs should embrace all funding. Many of the CRPs expect to finance growth and activity through bilateral funding negotiated with donors. Almost all bilateral funding is mapped to CRPs, and Lead Centers co-finance their program of work from Windows 1 and 2 and other sources of funding. Some bilateral funding may flow through Window 3, hence there needs to be vigilance in not double counting such funding.

It was recognized that bilateral or multilateral organizations have bilateral funding for designated countries and it is hard for such programs at the country level to direct resources into a fund. To the extent that these resources are added to a multilateral commitment that aids the overarching budget it is a positive source of additional bilateral funding, albeit restricted funding that remains outside the Fund. Hence, a rise in bilateral funding in this sense adds to the overall funding of the CGIAR System

Conclusion:

- *The Fund Council took note of the 2012 CRP Financing Plan in the context of availability of funds in Windows 1 and 2 in 2012.*

Note on Cost Sharing Percentage (CSP) to cover System Costs

Gordon presented the paper and highlighted the following points:

- Centers are requested to speed up modernization of internal costing systems so that indirect costs will reduce to 12-13% for most centers;
- Addition of 2% cost sharing will bring the total overhead rate to 14-15% which is a reasonable number;
- The modernization of internal costing systems will take 2-3 years to become fully operational;
- It continues to be difficult in some cases to recover the cost sharing percentage from bilateral grants;
- The Consortium will have a full report on donors unable or unwilling to comply with the CSP to cover system costs;
- Propose that the donors accept that the CSP may be slightly more than 2% for the next few years.

Discussion:

- It was pointed out that some donors may not be able to comply with this requirement.
- Clarification was sought on the reason why CSP has not yet been instituted.

Conclusions:

- *Consortium will prepare a more detailed paper for the March 2012 meeting on how to collect the CSP from bilateral donors, specifying which donors are unwilling or unable to comply and put forward a work plan on how the CSP is captured, reflected and processed. The suggested time period to make this policy operational is 24 months.*

Agenda Item 5. 2012 Work Plans and Budgets

The Chair thanked the Peer Review Team (PRT) for making a comparative analysis of the 2012 Work Plans and Budgets of the Consortium, the Fund Office and the ISPC in order to come to an understanding of the System Unit budgets and ensure that they are maintained at a reasonable level.

Philip Chiverton, as convener of the PRT, gave a brief summary of the work undertaken by the team. The mission of the PRT was to scrutinize the Work Plans and Budgets of the System Units in terms of value for money.

The Peer Review Team's analysis concluded that the proposed Consortium budget was too high. The Consortium Office had planned to set forth an activity based budget, but due to the resignation of the CEO, were unable to complete this in time. Philip commented that it was difficult to determine the deliverables in the budget and recommended that there be a prioritization of discretionary budget items, such as travel. The recommendation of the Peer Review was that the Consortium Office submit three different budget scenarios, \$4.5m, \$5m and \$5.5m, and describe different scenarios for salaries, activities and other components for virtual review and decision by the Fund Council.

The proposed budgets of the ISPC and Fund Office were found to be reasonable by the PRT. It was noted that recruitment of Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) positions would be delayed to mid- or end of 2012.

The Peer Review Team did not make recommendations on the proposed GCARD budget and left the decision to the FC.

Discussion:

- The Peer Review Team remarked on the high ratio of support staff to professional staff at the Fund Office. It was clarified that the FO is in the process of balancing its staffing mostly through attrition. As staff at the FO are World Bank staff, balancing the staffing profile necessarily needs to follow World Bank redundancy policies;
- Information was requested on savings elsewhere in the system in relation to savings in operations and potential scope of further savings to gain a more complete picture and make an informed decision;
- Additional information was requested on the scope of the Board evaluation that was mentioned in the Consortium Work Plan and the role, if any, of the FC in this regard;
- Several FC members requested information on the \$0.70 m of different sources of funding in relation to the Consortium budget;
- Clarification was sought on whether it is envisaged to have a Science Forum every year, and what is meant by mobilization and how one measures the effectiveness of the Science Forum in mobilization. The ISPC Chair clarified that the Science Forum is a mechanism to mobilize science by engaging other actors in the broader scientific community to participate and contribute to CGIAR programs; it is held in alternate years with the GCARD, although the Science Forum focuses on science. The outputs of the last Forum were a set of papers published in a high quality Journal that has become the highest cited edition of that journal. Similarly, a set of papers from the just completed Forum is expected to be published in a high impact journal and the breakout sessions will be posted the ISPC website;
- Clarification was also sought on the reason for the increase in the Trustee budget and the reason for not providing a breakdown of expenses. It was clarified that the Trustee costs in 2009 and 2010 was a percentage of funds held but not fully cost recovered. Since the funds held were very low the percentage cost charged to the Fund was relatively low. In compliance with the World Bank full cost recovery policy, the cost is not indexed to the funds held but the increase in Trustee expenses reflects this policy;
- It was pointed out that in order to have a credible Peer Review, its recommendations need to be taken seriously and suggested that a written explanation on priorities for spending in 2012 for the various components of the Consortium budget was necessary.
- The Consortium Board Chair addressed the concerns raised by the Peer Review Team and FC members on the Consortium budget as follows:

- The core resources the Consortium has requested from the Fund represents an increase of 13% over the comparable 2011 budget. This increase reflects the fact that the Consortium Office is in expansion mode, having established its office in March 2011 and has started a number of activities in which there was no prior precedence like legal activities and communications;
- The priorities are well articulated in the Consortium work plan. Some of them are: approval of the remainder of the CRPs, mainstreaming gender, foresight issues in relation to comparative advantage issues, and securing multi-year financing commitments;
- The budget reflects the resources required for the Consortium to work with 15 Centers. The Consortium was created in some ways as a governance body. Hence, in collaboration with the Centers, the Consortium requires to establish guidelines, criteria and fundamental elements of working together that will establish confidence and trust between the Centers and the Consortium. Much of the travel and workshops and meetings funding is for such collaborative activities
- The Trustee budget is based on real costs. However, unless there are unforeseen circumstances, the Trustee budget is expected to have reached a steady state.

Conclusions:

- *The Fund Office will produce a budget table template, including an annotation at the activity level that will be used henceforth by all System Units.*
- *The Fund Office will produce proposed efficiency measures to be reviewed at the March 2012 FC meeting.*

Decisions:

- *The Fund Council approved the 2012 budgets of the four System Units, i.e. the Consortium, the Fund Office, ISPC and the Trustee as presented.*
- *The budgets of the three System level entities i.e. the Consortium, the Fund Office and the ISPC will be capped at the 2012 level.*
- *The Fund Council approved the re-direction of the ISPC Chair's honoraria and office support of US \$323.30 as in the ISPC's 2012 budget to the Fund Office for the purpose of managing the ISPC Chair's contract;*
- *An annotated activity level budget for 2012 will be provided by the Consortium Office, the Fund Office and the ISPC Secretariat prior to the Fund Council meeting.*
- *The Peer Review Team will review the draft efficiency measurements and budget template with annotated commentary.*
- *On system level efficiency gains, it is expected that the draft templates would be approved at the March meeting, at which time the System level entities that will track these efficiencies will be determined.*

Agenda item 6. CRP1.1 Proposal - Dryland Systems: Integrated Agricultural Production Systems for the Poor and Vulnerable in Dry Areas

CRP1.1 was presented and discussed at FC4 in Montpellier. The FC decision was a category II decision, i.e. approved subject to a number of 'must haves'. The proponents subsequently submitted a revised proposal for virtual approval by the Fund Council on a no objection basis. The European FC members notified the Fund Office of their objection to the virtual approval of the

revised proposal. Hence, following the FC procedures the revised proposal was included as an agenda item for discussion at FC6.

Mahmoud Solh, Director General of ICARDA (the Lead Center) was invited to provide a brief context of the revised proposal.

He explained that the CRP has already envisioned an inception phase and has a detailed proposal which clearly indicates that the FC members' comments have been taken into account. It is expected that the 7 inception workshops will provide detailed log frames as well as very specific outputs. The workshops will involve a wide range of stake holder participants from NARS, farmer organizations, NGOs, civil society, women organizations and private and government entities.

EIARD requested a discussion on CRP 1.1 at FC6 for the following reasons:

CRP 1.1 was approved under the proviso that the proposal is revised to meet a list of "must haves", giving ISPC the responsibility to check that these "must haves" have been met by the revised proposal. The ISPC has clearly established that a significant number of "must haves" have not been met. As a consequence and according to the process established by the 4th Fund Council, the proposal could not be accepted by the FC, and EIARD logically objected to its virtual approval.

The ISPC also indicated in its comments that several of the most important missing "must haves" can only be met through meetings during an inception phase. EIARD supported this idea of inception workshops to further develop and then resubmit the proposal, but noted that the modalities of such an inception phase for a CRP have not yet been established.

EIARD proposed to focus the debate on what are the next steps intended/ planned by the CRP 1.1 proponents to meet the remaining 'must haves', including the respective roles of the ISPC, Consortium, and Fund Council in this process, as well as the required funding arrangements.

The ISPC Chair advised that the central issue of CRP1.1 continued to be at a conceptual level. The ISPC Chair commented that the ISPC is expected to provide an ex-ante analysis of inputs to the CRPs. This includes 5 criteria of analysis of which scientific quality, appropriate partnerships and coherence are all critical elements. In reviewing the systems level projects it was clear that the definition of the science in the program, the partners and the sites where the research will occur is not available, hence this lack of clarity underpins the ISPC's analyses.

Discussion:

- Resubmitted document is much stronger and an inception phase is fundamental to deliver the missing details. However the issue continues to be the lack of clarity in mapping the relationship between the hypotheses, outputs and activities. The Consortium needs to provide effective monitoring and learning in partnership with the ISPC for the comfort of the FC. Inception phase is critical to the success of the CRP. Need to strengthen partners' commitment to the process and a stronger focus on targeted populations, particularly the poorest sector within that population group;
- The 7 planned inception workshops to be linked and mobilized through the regional fora. These conversations required to be linked together, hence using an objective multi-stakeholder convening mechanism to link the processes would be most effective and efficient way forward;

- ISPC needs to sign off after assessment on the quality of science. This could be done once the methodology and research questions had been defined more clearly and full funding approved by the FC;
- ISPC's mandated role in ensuring continuity and excellence in research would be more helpful than providing a check within the research process;
- Some members wondered whether the approval via a categorization process is working, particularly with regard to category 2 – which is an approval with conditions. As CRP 1.1 shows the program is unable to meet the conditions placed by the FC without starting its work. This raised the question of its link back to the monitoring and evaluation aspects of the FC and the ISPC;
- The impact indicators in the revised proposal require better formulation and description. This is best done with a participatory approach and the inception phase will allow the opportunity to define and clarify such aspects;
- Many of the issues raised by ISPC at FC4 could not be addressed until after the inception workshops. Hence an appropriate framing of the conditions would provide the flexibility to proceed with category 2 approvals.

Following the discussion Mahmoud Solh was invited to address concerns raised. He made the following clarifications:

- The CRP supported a “stop sign” after the inception period;
- Ground work will be done prior to the inception phase. It will identify major production systems and specific targeted areas including the action sites, major constraints and opportunities for increasing productive systems resilience and reducing vulnerability and for diversifying and sustainably intensifying production systems;
- The inception workshops will fine tune the research hypotheses, prioritize setting of the main research undertakings, develop a complete log frame for each target region, identify specific sites, activities and underpinning science and scientific approach and methods with stakeholders and construct the needed budget. This process will also include additional resource mobilization;
- He pointed out that with a program approval for one year only, it would be difficult to hold meaningful inception workshops without an ongoing work program and budget to support planned activities.
- Requested the FC to tentatively approve the program with ISPC taking stock of the science once the inception was complete and the right of the FC to curtail the funding at that point if it feels that the program is not progressing in the right direction.

Conclusion:

- *FC thanked Mahmoud Solh and his co-proponents.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

Agenda Item 7. CRP5 Proposal - Water, Land and Ecosystems

The revised CRP5 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair.

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the revised CRP 5 proposal be “approved subject to minor revision taking into account its commentary.”

Collin Chartres, Director General of IWMI, made a brief presentation of the revised proposal. In response specifically to a comment raised on a previous version of the proposal, he informed the Council that the IWMI Board has agreed that the DG will not be a member of the CRP Steering Committee, but will act as resource person to help ensure that program activities are up and running as quickly as possible.

Discussion:

The Chair noted that IWMI had re-worked and reduced the proposal significantly in scope. Since CRP 5 proposal was presented to the FC three times previously and FC members generally agreed with ISPC comments, it was agreed that further discussion was not needed.

Proposed Budget of CRP5:

	(in \$ million)			
	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1 and 2	163.781	40.367	55.361	68.052
Window 3 & Bilateral	82.472	35.775	27.949	18.748
Sub-Total	246.254	76.142	83.311	86.800

Conclusions:

- *FC thanked Colin Chartres and his co-proponents for the revised CRP5 proposal.*
- *FC’s decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

Agenda Item 8. CRP3.5 Proposal - Grain Legumes: Leveraging legumes to combat poverty, hunger, malnutrition, and environmental degradation

The CRP3.5 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by William Dar, Director General of ICRISAT (the Lead Center).

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC’s written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the proposal be “approved subject to substantial revisions and resubmission”. It pointed out that it is “harder to value secondary crops compared to the major cereals, however a global program on grain legumes must shoulder this challenge”. It further noted that “a more streamlined governance and management structure is needed to provide independence in decision making, monitoring, and evaluation” in the CRP.

Discussion:

- Track record of the CRP partnerships for participatory and inter-disciplinary research was raised.
- Projects such as Tropical Legumes II had already demonstrated that seed systems can be changed with innovative processes such as the small packs.
- Critical for proponents to strengthen the case for investment in research on Grain Legumes (GL), address the questions raised by the ISPC on the basis of past trends in GL consumption and production; dedicate more attention to possible “future” trends, in particular regarding access to plant proteins versus animal proteins.
- More attention be given to learning from previous successes and failures of research and innovation, which will help to clearly identify the researchable questions and to improve the proposed delivery mechanisms.

- Higher degree of prioritization, both at the thematic and at the geographic levels, is required.
- Further attention to be given to the Monitoring and Evaluation system.
- Farmer's organizations, extension workers and NGOs are under-represented. There is lack of details on specific organizations and their role, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Concerns on the governance structure of the CRP were raised.
- The CRP seemed to be more of a coordinated effort rather than a fully integrated program, and a rigorous assessment of the prioritization among regions, strategic objectives and crops is needed.
- Further analysis regarding the benefits to the poor and more focus on the tradeoffs is needed, given that value adding would increase the price of net purchases.
- A more thorough treatment is required on constraints, particularly on production yield gaps and reasons for consumption and markets not having improved. Better integration of the crop improvement aspects with resource management is also needed.
- Additional attention is required on the adoption of research outputs by farmers. It was recommended that the CRP adopt participatory technology development methodologies and give more attention to the cropping systems approach.

William Dar was invited to respond to the questions raised by FC members. He reminded the FC that detailed written comments had already been circulated and he would like to highlight 4 overarching points:

- **Priority Setting:** the CRP opted to develop a priority setting by region to account for actual situations from a regional and crop perspective. This will continue to be adjusted as the CRP is implemented.
- **Partnerships:** the CRP is committed to working with various research and development partners; however they will be selective and characterize the process as strengthened partnership with a purpose.
- **Seed Systems:** the initial successes of the Tropical Legumes II project will be upscaled in the CRP.
- **Management Structure:** the CRP will be guided by the views expressed by the ISPC and FC members. A simple flat structure is necessary to successfully implement the CRP.

Proposed Budget of CRP3.5:

The proposed budget for CRP3.5 Grain Legumes (shown below), differs by \$1.275 million between the proposal and the presentation at the FC6 meeting. The budget increase was explained as an adjustment in management cost which was not included in the first year based on the expectation that the CRP will be approved sometime in 2011. Given the timing of the FC6 in November, the start date of the CRP is now expected in 2012 which in the proponent's judgment will necessitate the inclusion of management cost in year 1.

(in \$ million)				
	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	94.157	19.893	33.048	41.216
Window 3 & Bilateral	43.962	18.626	14.628	10.708
Total	138.119	38.519	47.676	51.924

Conclusions:

- *FC thanked William Dar and his co-proponents for the CRP3.5 proposal.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

Agenda Item 9. CRP3.6 Proposal - Dryland Cereals: A global alliance for improving food security, nutrition and economic growth for the world's most vulnerable poor

The CRP3.6 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Member Ganesan Balachanderand presented by David Hoisington, Deputy Director General of ICRISAT (the Lead Center).

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the proposal be "approved subject to substantial revisions and resubmission". It pointed out that the "program has a chance to harness synergies in terms of research on these cereal crops; however, the current proposal is not clear on what and how those synergies are going to be achieved;". It further noted that better justification and prioritization of the proposed work plans was needed on a crop specific basis and areas of efficiency gains could be identified from pooling research efforts.

Discussion:

- Proponents should significantly strengthen the case for this CRP at two levels - explaining why CGIAR and its partners must invest in dry land cereals and why they should invest through a specific CRP dedicated to these dry land cereals as opposed to integrating these activities in other CRPs. Furthermore, researchable questions and hypothesis have to be clarified.
- More consideration should be given to the potential of local innovation to inspire novel research, and impact pathways should be significantly improved.
- Monitoring and Evaluation system needed further attention.
- There was a need to elaborate on the synergies and working interactions with other CRPs, in particular CRP 1.1, but also CRP 4 and CRP 7.
- Concerns were raised regarding the governance structure of this CRP.
- Focus was needed on the target populations that would be a better starting point than just the agro-eco system itself.
- The proposal lists a number of nominal partners; however in practice their roles are not clearly defined. There is a lack of focus on the capability of the various partners. The proposal needed to clarify how this will be assessed and how the program will deal with weak partners.
- When one looks at the trend analysis of some of these commodities, especially with respect to yield, consumption and price, are there possibilities for intervention to reverse the trends?
- The proposal should elaborate on communicating results in different ways and specifically to women stakeholders and build on the strengths of the respective programs that have been in place for many years.
- The proposal could be stronger on social science as this reflects the kinds of communities the research is trying to reach.
- Renewed emphasis on capacity strengthening was seen positively by the FC.

In his response to some of the concerns, William Dar assured the Fund council that the justification for the dry land cereals CRP will be strengthened, the importance of the interface with CRP1.1 and CRP7 will be better recognized, and partnerships will be inclusive but very strategic.

Proposed Budget of CRP3.6:

The proposed budget for CRP3.6 Dryland Cereals (shown below), differs by \$1.086 million between the proposal and the presentation at the FC6 meeting. The budget increase was explained as an adjustment in management cost which was not included in the first year based on the expectation that the CRP will be approved sometime in 2011. Given the timing of the FC6 in November, the start date of the CRP is now expected in 2012 which in the proponent's judgment will necessitate the inclusion of management cost in year 1.

(in \$ million)

	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	50.383	9.773	16.169	24.441
Window 3 & Bilateral	28.431	13.274	9.623	5.534
Total	78.814	23.047	25.792	29.975

Conclusions:

- *FC thanked William Dar, David Hoisington and the co-proponents for the CRP3.6 proposal.*
- *FC's decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

Agenda Item 10. CRP1.2 Proposal - Humidtropics: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics

The CRP1.2 proposal was introduced by the Consortium Board Chair and presented by Paula Bramel, Deputy Director General of IITA (the Lead Center).

The ISPC Chair gave a summary of the ISPC's written commentary previously circulated to the Fund Council. The ISPC recommended that the proposal be "substantially revised and re-submitted with particular emphasis given to the main points" raised in the commentary. It was pointed out that CRP1.2 is perhaps the most difficult proposal in the CGIAR portfolio to develop, as it is a mosaic and very complex in terms of niches, environmental domains and crops and peoples. Furthermore, the ISPC noted that the revised proposal needs to narrow the geographic focus.

Discussion:

- The proposal needs to convincingly demonstrate commitment to a reformed CGIAR system, with genuine cross-center collaboration and with development results as the key objectives.
- There is a need to make a convincing case that the proposal will make a difference for the people of the humid tropics and will have an impact on the 4 System Level Objectives of the CGIAR.
- Impact pathways should be clearly defined.
- The proposal should provide further justification for the dominant focus on humid lowlands as opposed to humid tropical highlands; clearly elaborate the cross linkages with other CRPs; and clarify proposed partnerships, including the basis for engagement of the different partners and the high institutional overhead costs.
- The proposal needs to be clear on the program's deliverables.
- There is duplicity of efforts in policy and cross-cutting issues. This is very apparent particularly in system CRPs, which should be tackled at the System level, rather than at the program level.

- One donor asked why the Consortium Board and the ISPC were far apart in their opinion of the quality and completeness of this proposal.

Paula Bramel responded in detail to the questions raised. There were three main areas of concern:

- **Lack of detail:** The proponents agreed that this is the case. However, it was pointed out systems programs require a lot of consultation and these consultations are planned to be during the process of implementation. The success of the CRP depends on adequate consultation and strong partnerships.
- **Missing links to issues of forestry and aquaculture:** Following FC’s suggestion that the appropriate placement of agro-forestry be decided by discussion between CRP6 and CRP1.2, it was recognized that the needs for agro-forestry inputs could come from CRP6 and need not be duplicated in CRP1.2. To that end, CRP1.2 has targeted focal points within CIFOR and ICRAF that would make the link with agro-forestry. Similar consultations and discussions are expected to link aquaculture and CRP1.2
- **Focus of research targets:** At the time of determining target areas there were good opportunities and links between highland and lowland humid tropics and it was felt that by including both would provide opportunities for impact. Hence, both regions were included in the targeted area. Similarly when considering the inclusion of sub-humid and humid tropics, particularly in West Africa, the strong link between food production and forestry was the deciding factor to retain both areas.

Proposed Budget of CRP1.2:

	(in \$ million)			
	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Windows 1&2	69.192	19.508	23.671	26.013
Window 3 & Bilateral	75.226	28.836	24.306	24.084
Total	144.418	46.344	47.977	50.097

Conclusions:

- *FC thanked Paula Bramel and her co-proponents for the CRP 1.2 proposal.*
- *FC’s decision on the proposal is presented in the conclusions under Agenda Item 11.*

Report from Consortium Board Chair on the Genetic Resources Scoping Study

The Consortium Board Chair reminded the FC members of the Genetic Resources Scoping Study commissioned by the Consortium Board to identify possible gaps of relevance to global food security which were not addressed by the current portfolio of CRPs. The report identified some gaps and the Consortium Board decided these gaps could be addressed within existing CRPs rather than through the creation of new mechanisms. Thus, a short proposal on strengthening agro-biodiversity research in three areas: research to develop improved management options, research on supporting policies, and research on mechanisms for upscaling management options to be incorporated in CRP 1.1 is expected shortly.

The Consortium Board considers CRP 1.1 would be strengthened by the integration of such a component in its research for development agenda. It considers that the inclusion of this new component is appropriate as it will create a critical mass of expertise concerning the *in-situ* management of agro-biodiversity and therefore suggests that the issue of how this component will be integrated into CRP 1.1 be part of the program’s inception phase.

Conclusions:

- *Discussion on CRP1.1 was closed and was not reopened.*
- *Further background information is required for FC to make an informed decision.*
- *The Consortium was requested to table the appropriate information so that in the event an addendum to the proposal is required, it could be considered by the FC.*

Agenda Item 11. Decision Session on Agenda Items 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10

The Chair reminded the FC of the four categories of decisions that were adopted at FC4 in the Council's decision making process. They are as follows:

CATEGORY I: Approval

- Light adjustments which the Fund Council expects proponents to take into consideration

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- 'Must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Virtual 'no-objection' approval of the proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision will be taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

CATEGORY III: Request re-submission of the CRP proposal

- Substantial 'must haves'
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with 'Must haves' addressed
- Decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

CATEGORY IV: Rejection

Discussion:

- FC Members remarked that clarity in describing the approval parameters of CRP1.1 is extremely important as conditional approvals have been used before which have not turned out as expected. Hence, it is critical to clearly define the scope of the approval and set the framework for resubmission in the event that it does not get a favorable review by the ISPC.
- ISPC commented that the degree to which they could help CRPs such as CRP 1.1 to move forward was to provide ex-ante advice early in the process and names of experts in the field that could participate in the inception workshops to help formulate hypotheses and work plans etc. Any deeper involvement by ISPC would compromise the independence of the advice that is expected from the ISPC.

Decisions:

- **CRP1.1 - Dryland Systems: Integrated Agricultural Production systems for the Poor and Vulnerable in Dry Areas**

Unconditional Approval

- *An inception phase that may use resource of \$10 million from Windows 1 and 2 component of the revised proposal submitted in July 2011. The period of the inception phase is left to the judgment of the Lead Center.*

Conditional Approval

- *The FC conditionally approved the overall proposal (program content, remaining Windows 1 and 2 budget of \$60.33 million, and Window 3 and bilateral component). The proponents will revise the proposal based on the activities during the inception phase. The revised proposal will be submitted to the Fund Council. ISPC will submit a*

commentary on the revised proposal and advise the Fund Council. The revised proposal will be circulated to the Fund Council for virtual approval on 'no-objection' basis. If there is objection, the Chair of the Fund Council and the Chair of the Consortium Board will discuss and agree on the next course of action

- **CRP5 - Water Land and Ecosystems - *The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was Approved with Light Adjustments (Category I)***
 - ***Light Adjustments: Please see Annex 1***
- **CRP 3.5 - Grain Legumes: Leveraging legumes to combat poverty, hunger, malnutrition and environmental degradation -*The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was Approved with Conditions (Category II)***
 - ***Must Haves: Please see Annex 2***
- **CRP 3.6 - Dryland Cereals: A global alliance for improving food security, nutrition and economic growth for the world's most vulnerable poor - *The overall proposal (program content, total budget and its components) was Approved with Conditions (Category II)***
 - ***Must Haves: Please see Annex 3***
- **CRP1.2 - Humidtropics: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics - *The decision was Request re-submission of the CRP proposal (Category III) with substantial revisions.***
 - ***Must Haves: Please see Annex 4***

Summary of Budgets:

CRP No	CRP Title	Lead Center	Total Budget (\$M)	Funds from W1&W2 (\$ M)	No of Years
Category I - Approval with light adjustments					
CRP5	Water, Land and Ecosystems	IWMI	246.254	163.781	3
Category II - Approval with conditions					
CRP3.5	Grain Legumes: Leveraging legumes to combat poverty, hunger, malnutrition and environmental degradation	ICRISAT	138.119	94.157	3
CRP3.6	Dryland Cereals: A global alliance for improving food security, nutrition and economic growth for the world's most vulnerable poor	ICRISAT	78.814	50.383	3
Category III- Request re-submission with substantial revisions					
CRP1.2	Humidtropics: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics	IITA	144.418	69.192	3
Other Decision on CRP 1.1 Dryland Systems					
	Decision	Lead Center	Total Budget (\$M)	Funds from W1&W2 (\$ M)	No of Years
	Unconditional approval for the inception phase and use of portion of the proposed budget	ICARDA	10.0	10.0	Inception period
	Conditional approval of the overall program and remaining budget	ICARDA	112.725	60.333	To be determined

Agenda Item 12. CGIAR Fund: The Way Forward on Predictability of Donor Contributions

Jonathan Wadsworth made a presentation on the way forward regarding predictability of donor contributions. The need to get a high degree of regularity of funding was initially discussed at FC5. At FC's request, the Fund Office and the Trustee prepared a background paper, which was distributed.

The objective of the discussion was to explore mechanisms to increase stability, reliability and predictability of multi-year funding, build a prudent level of liquidity and manage the timeliness of projected donor transfers. Regular and systematic process to replenish resources is critical, hence the donors were requested to consider the timing and cycling of contributions, and a voluntary but predictable approach to information on the size of contributions to enable a longer term planning for research programs.

Discussion:

- Some donors expressed the view that it was possible for them to make multi-year commitments – however the shift in process was required to be set in motion, which may need time.
- Other donors cautioned that the anticipation of moving to another global financing facility may not be feasible.
- There was a clear call for the CGIAR Centers to work towards one common platform of funding and not solicit funding for individual centers as this did not project the image of a cohesive system.
- It was pointed out that there are two types of bilateral funding. While “core” funding could be bilateral, there was also “restricted” funding that was provided by country programs of multilateral agencies that are targeted to particular areas or countries but are multi-year and predictable for the duration of the project.
- Several donors mentioned that funds flow from various pockets of the government/agency and for the most part CGIAR funding is from research budgets and will continue to require annual approvals.
- Donors expressed concern that multi-year funding will require exceptionally good *ex-ante* assessments of achievements for the funding period. *Ex-ante* assessment of benefits of CRPs was not uniform.

Conclusions:

- *Formal replenishment mechanisms was ruled out as it was not compatible with CGIAR funding; however at present the timing of the receipt of funds was not predictable even within the year of allocation. Thus managing resource flows with a predictable program and unpredictable inflow is very difficult.*
- *Consider a high level meeting, not in terms of a contribution meeting but in terms of getting resonance at all levels of the bureaucracy that allocate funds, and convey the message that CGIAR System is important and is an issue that resonates with the multilateral system.*
- *The Fund Office will consult with a sub group of FC members as advised by the incoming Chair, which will prepare a think piece that would be considered further at the next FC meeting. The think piece would be a general paper based on inputs provided by FC members to move towards predictability of funding - whether based on projections or on firm amounts.*

Agenda Item 13. Appointment of New Fund Council Chair (Closed Session)

The Chair announced that the closed session concluded with the election of Rachel Kyte, World Bank VP of SDN as the new FC Chair.

Agenda Item 14: CGIAR Policy for Independent External Evaluation

Jonathan Wadsworth framed the discussion, which is based on the paper presented by the IEA Design Team. The paper proposed principles for evaluation in the CGIAR as well as a policy for the independent external evaluation.

ISPC Chair provided the following viewpoints:

- The space between the ISPC and IEA is clear. While the ISPC role is *ex ante* analysis of inputs to programs, the evaluation is concerned with outputs of programs;
- There is clarity on impact assessment vs. evaluation. Impact assessment is not of a program, but of an area of research that may or may not have achieved impact. The role of SPIA is to do an impact assessment of a research area or research issue and it is a summative opinion and not a progressive evaluation;
- All CRP components need to be reviewed within a 5 year time frame;
- There is need for single track evaluation system that is consistent with regard to rigor and fairness and is a level playing field for how evaluations are conducted.

Discussion

- FC members emphasized that Center-level reviews need to remain and cannot be abolished.
- FC members were explicit in requiring a single track evaluation approach. Going forward, there will be a harmonized system for M&E.
- It is highly important that CRPs put in place metrics that measure progress towards achieving their outputs and outcomes; the narrative in the paper by the IEA design team does not show the specificity of how they will achieve this.
- FC members were not in favor of integrating IEA with SPIA; they saw evaluation as a way to monitor progress towards achieving certain goals, whereas SPIA is more an ex-post evaluation activity not directly related to a particular CRP.
- Considerable emphasis has been given to a range of processes such as output efficiency and outcome development impacts; however emphasis on the quality of the research is not as strong. More detail around the evaluation of the quality of the research would be an important enhancement.
- The SPIA model should be examined when setting up the IEA; annual monitoring reports from the Consortium Board will be a part of the building blocks of the system level evaluations;
- Members expressed interest in a timetable on operationalization of the IEA office;

Conclusion:

- *The Fund Office will take ownership of the paper and revise it on the basis of comments received and circulate to FC for approval.*
- *The IEA budget was not discussed, hence not approved. The nominal projected budget indicator for projection will continue to be use.*
- *The head of the IEA needs to understand the enterprise, has global name recognition in the agricultural research evaluation field, and generally in evaluation;*
- *FAO will provide a timetable for the establishment of the IEA Office. If there is no clear path forward by February 15, 2012, the Fund Office will put together an alternate plan for discussion and approval at the meeting in March 2012.*

Agenda Item 15. Any Other Business

At the opening session, the following items were requested to be added under Agenda Item 15:

- Metrics for efficiency gains
- Celebrating CGIAR's 40th Anniversary at FAO
- CGIAR Funding for GCARD2

Funding of Infrastructure Investment and Maintenance Costs of CGIAR Centers

Switzerland informed the FC of a recent visit by Center DGs requesting for assistance in upgrading Center infrastructure and expressed the view that this is a broader question that requires to be addressed at the system level and wished clarity on how it can be addressed.

Discussion:

- A more general discussion needs to take place on handling this issue;
- The Consortium Board Chair pointed out that this is a system issue and not an individual center's issue; it therefore requires a discussion between the Consortium and the Centers to come up with possible solutions that can be proposed to the FC for its consideration.

Conclusions:

- *The Fund is not in a position to handle financing infrastructure upgrades at this time;*
- *Host country and private sector contributions, and other longer term opportunities need to be looked into to raise financing for research center infrastructure projects.*

Metrics for Efficiency Gains

In consultation with Gates Foundation and in view that under Agenda Item 5 on 2012 Work Plan and Budgets a template for efficiency gains is being prepared for discussion by the Peer Review Team, the Gates Foundation agreed to take this item off the “Any Other Business” agenda.

Celebrating CGIAR’s 40th Anniversary at FAO

FAO, through its office of Knowledge Exchange Research and Extension, in close collaboration with IFAD, Consortium Board, and Fund Office is organizing an event to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the CGIAR in Rome during the week of FAO's Council Meeting. It is a short event, which will be participated by the FAO Director General, IFAD Vice President, Chair of the Consortium Board, Executive Secretary of the Fund Council as well as an eminent scientist, Yuan Longping, the father of hybrid rice. FC members were invited to attend.

CGIAR Funding for GCARD2 requested by the Consortium Board Chair

The Consortium Board Chair reminded FC members that at the last meeting it was decided that the FC will consider GCARD budgets that were submitted through the Consortium Board. A budget for GCARD2 was received, requesting a total contribution from the CGIAR Fund of \$1.67million, with support for direct costs of \$930,000 equivalent to 42% of the total conference cost and a component of \$740,000 for GCARD pre-processes. The Consortium Board requested FC's guidance on the budget.

Discussion:

- Members were very concerned about holding a conference that costs about \$2 million and specifically at the costs tabled for VIP and travel costs of 220 participants.
- It was noted that there is a 2% red line for CSP, which would be very difficult to go beyond.
- It was pointed out that in order to maintain the 2% CSP threshold the GCARD budget would need to be halved.

- FC was reminded that the G-20 meeting in Montpellier had discussed GCARD in the context of increasing support for agricultural research generally and that GCARD has a broader significance in nesting CGIAR Research into the broader reform of agricultural research for development. Thus it should be seen from the standpoint of what the requirements are to make GCARD a success rather than whether it fits into the 2% CSP threshold.
- There was a strong view that GFAR needs to look into achieving GCARD's objectives, which are very compelling and worth achieving in new and innovative ways such as social media, blogs or a smaller meeting.

Conclusion:

- *GFAR was requested to put forward, in consultation with the Consortium, a new proposal that takes on board innovative ways of doing business, outreach and communications and combine them in a scaled-down face-to-face meeting.*

Closing

The Chair thanked IFAD for its hospitality and for the use of its excellent facilities and support.

On behalf of the Fund Council, Jonathan Wadsworth thanked Inger Andersen for her leadership and commitment to the CGIAR. A scroll of appreciation was presented to Inger for her contribution and endeavors on behalf of the CGIAR.

CRP5 Proposal: Water, Land and Ecosystems

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY I – Approval with light adjustments

CATEGORY I: Approval with light adjustments

- Light Adjustments

B. Light Adjustments

1. Needs strengthening of ‘cause-and-effect’ thinking in some SRPs;
2. Some hypotheses need to undergo rigorous and objective testing rather than seeking information to provide justification;
3. Elements of the ecosystem perspective and respective analysis need to be provided in some SRPs;
4. Productivity – ecosystem services trade-offs need to be identified at the lower project level;
5. The Rainfed System SRP needs to be better integrated and strengthened in terms of focus, likely impacts, and in its IPG content;
6. Strengthen the links between the work on pastoral systems and relevant work in other CRPs at the design stage;
7. Clarify proposed activities on issues of land and water rights, addressing at the same time one boundary issue between CRP 5 and CRP 2;
8. Co-localizing and sharing of sentinel sites together with other CRPs are encouraged.
9. When formulating operational plans, spell out outcome indicators in explicit and verifiable terms for the different SRPs;
10. Further development of M&E system should be a priority;
11. Explore potential for broader collaboration and additional funding by holding dialogue with donors of related programs, e.g. West Africa/Sahel integrated land use program funded by GEF.

CRP3.5 – Grain Legumes: Leveraging legumes to combat poverty, hunger, malnutrition, and environmental degradation

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC¹:

1. A much stronger description of the potential of research on grain legumes (GLs) to decrease poverty and hunger as a basis for prioritizing crop-region-constraint combinations. It should:
 - a. Objectively demonstrate the relative importance of these crops in the CGIAR portfolio, drawing on information related to GL-specific producers and consumers in the different target regions;
 - b. Undertake a comprehensive assessment of past research efforts and current barriers to adoption of technology, as a basis for identifying key constraints and opportunities that could be influenced by CRP3.5 research products;
 - c. Establish targets for outcomes in a crop by region matrix to account for actual situations and current status from a regional and crop species perspective, and strengthen capacity to prioritize allocation of resources for GL research within this CRP and within the CGIAR;
2. A work plan with more focus and fewer product lines: that this CRP concluded with such a large number of product lines (61 crop/traits for genetic improvement) indicates the difficulty of moving from individual programs to a global program within a CRP;
3. Given limited success to date in the adoption of improved GL technologies¹, demonstrate feasible impact pathways, citing relevant references and documentation;
4. This CRP should be closely allied to and integrated into the system CRPs, and particularly CRP1.1.
5. Highlight the new and most promising areas of research: the list of innovation initiatives and cross-learning opportunities on p122-123 are ambitious and commendable and deserve a more prominent place in the proposal, with an explanation of the value that would be generated by succeeding in each of these initiatives;

¹ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC6 documents website as:

http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/crp3.5_ispc_commentary_oct13_2011.pdf

6. In management and governance, a more streamlined structure is needed that provides for independence in decision making, monitoring and evaluation. (i) The Advisory Panel needs to be more appropriately structured and resourced with formal oversight by the Lead Center Board; (ii) redundancies in the Steering Committee and the Program Management Team need to be addressed; (iii) the role and authority of the CRP Director needs to be strengthened; and (iv) the CRP management functions central to the success of the program, including communications, resource mobilization, and program evaluation, need to be clarified, adequately resourced and managed.

From FC Members:

1. Higher degree of prioritization, both at the thematic and at the geographic levels, is required;
2. Further attention should be given to M&E system;
3. Farmer's organizations, extension workers and NGOs are under-represented; need to provide details on specific organizations and their role, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa; proposal needs to show evidence of involvement of sub-regional organizations and their networks;
4. Specify practical commitments and investments required of other partners engaged.
5. Further analysis is needed on possible trade-offs implied by the new emphasis on value chains; proponents need to consider location specificity that IPGs may be difficult to generate in deciding on which value chains to select for intensive research;
6. Participatory technology development through enhanced on-farm research, with farmers managing their own fields, is recommended to be part of the program; it needs to refocus SO3 to include cropping systems research on farm and with farmers;
7. Need better integration of the crop improvement aspects with resource management.
8. Provide description of the relationship with other initiatives like Tropical Legumes I and II (TL I and TL II);
9. Links to CRP 2 could be better articulated on the issue of policy bias against small farm enterprises, which generally characterize grain legume production;
10. Budget allocations for SO1 (genetic resources) for CRP 3.5 should be differentiated from the budget allocation that was made for the gene banks.

CRP3.6 – Dryland Cereals: A global alliance for improving food security, nutrition and economic growth for the world’s most vulnerable poor

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY II – Approval with conditions; revised proposal to be submitted to FC

CATEGORY II: Approval with conditions

- ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Virtual ‘no-objection’ approval of the revised proposal by the Fund Council
- If there is objection, decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC²:

1. Provide an improved analysis and presentation of the target populations who can realistically be expected to benefit from the CRP 3.6 research;
2. Justify and prioritize better the proposed work plans on a crop-specific basis; pool research efforts in identified areas across two or more of the dryland cereals for greater efficiency;
3. Reduce the scope of research in terms of crops and target areas when likely effectiveness of the research at scale cannot be demonstrated;
4. Do an analysis of current work to identify barriers to adoption and shifting to new areas of innovative research and approaches to overcome these barriers;
5. Present new and innovative approaches to overcome constraints to adoption of the range of technologies by the poor and vulnerable, particularly in Africa, and to increase the likelihood of impacts in their livelihoods;
6. Present realistic and research-specific impact pathways that carefully address the conditioning factors and incorporate feedback loops;
7. Show better integration of CRP3.6 with CRP1.1 (Dryland Systems), as well as justification for their separate identities or merger; there needs to be a plan to monitor the impact pathways for CRP 3.6 cereals research drawing lessons from both CRPs;
8. Streamline the governance and management structure providing for independence in decision making, monitoring and evaluation: (i) structure and resource the Advisory Panel with formal oversight by the Lead Center Board; (ii) address redundancies in the Steering Committee and the Program Management Team; (iii) strengthen the role and authority of the CRP Director; and (iv) clarify and adequately resource the CRP management functions (including communications, resource mobilization, and program evaluation).

² More detailed commentary is posted on the FC6 documents website as:

http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/crp3.6_ispc_commentary_oct13_2011.pdf

From FC Members:

1. Strengthen the case for this CRP at two levels - explaining why CGIAR and its partners must invest in dry land cereals and why they should invest through *a specific CRP* dedicated to these dry land cereals as opposed to integrating these activities in other CRPs;
2. Greater consideration should be given to the potential of local innovation to inspire novel research, and impact pathways should be significantly improved;
3. Provide further attention to Monitoring and Evaluation system;
4. Elaborate on the synergies and working interactions with other CRPs, in particular CRP 1.1, but also CRP 4 and CRP 7;
5. Elaborate on communicating results in different ways and specifically to women stakeholders;
6. Further clarification and justification for the priorities and proposed budget allocations among SOs and the DCs are required;
7. Focus more on the specific conditions of the targeted population (where and who live - the people for which an appropriate research program on dryland cereals can really make a difference);
8. Present evidence of linkages with the Regional Fora and other constituencies and/or community of practitioners in the development of the proposal. There is no indication of relative allocation of resources between the CGIAR centers involved and partners;
9. Provide information on formal commitment of other partners in the budget, beyond statements of expected contributions in kind and/or activities to be conducted;
10. Explore linkage to CCAFS and to view the proposed research through a 'climate smart agriculture' lens.

CRP1.2 Proposal - Humidtropics: Integrated Systems for the Humid Tropics

A. Fund Council Decision: CATEGORY III – Re-submission of the proposal with substantial revisions

CATEGORY III: Re-submission of the CRP proposal

- Substantial ‘Must haves’
- ISPC review of revised CRP proposal with ‘Must haves’ addressed
- Decision taken at a face to face Fund Council Meeting

B. ‘Must haves’

From ISPC³:

1. Prioritize research questions and approaches to be carried out at the most important action sites, taking the following into consideration:
 - a. careful selection of sites and identifying jointly with other CRPs the research to be provided by other programs and partners active in humid zones.
 - b. scientific and socio-developmental lessons learned from prior research
 - c. means to evaluate the effectiveness of the hypothesized approaches
2. Identify impact pathways for the new research that map directly to the system level outcomes (SLOs);
3. Draw together more coherently the different elements of gender to be included in a gender strategy and link them to the processes of technological innovation and research;
4. Consider the best means to address high priority research to enhance the contribution of tree crops to livelihoods in the humid tropics;
5. Show how and in what time frame the program will change from the current aggregation of partner Centers’ research to new place-based research according to the hypotheses and models espoused, and with an appropriate growth rate and budget;
6. Present new governance arrangements that will enable growth of a new CRP1.2 program for the humid zones as a genuinely cross Center program working effectively with external partners.

From FC Members:

1. Need to demonstrate genuine cross-center collaboration and with development results as the key objectives, a key objective of the reformed CGIAR system;
2. Make a convincing case that the proposal will make a difference for the people of the humid tropics and will have an impact on the 4 System Level Objectives of the CGIAR;
3. Clearly outline what needs to be achieved and what is going to be achieved; the proposal needs to be clear on the program’s deliverables;

³ More detailed commentary is posted on the FC6 document website as:
http://www.cgiarfund.org/cgiarfund/sites/cgiarfund.org/files/Documents/PDF/crp_1.2_ispc_commentary.pdf

4. Provide further justification for the dominant focus on humid lowlands as opposed to humid tropical highlands;
5. Clearly elaborate on the cross linkages with other CRPs; it is not clear how these collaborations will work in practice as the current proposal does not integrate clearly issues such as climate change, deforestation, agroforestry or nutrition;
6. The section on proposed partnerships requires clarification on the basis for engagement of the different partners (including farmer organizations, NGOs, extension workers, and the private sector);
7. Capacity development should focus not only on production research, but also on skills required for opportunities in post-harvest innovation and value addition, or new approaches to knowledge sharing, scaling up and fostering small enterprise.